

**REMARKS**

Claims **1, 3, 6-9, 11, 14-17, 19, 22-27** and **33** are pending in the application.

Claims **1, 3, 6-9, 11, 14-17, 19, 22-27** and **33** have been rejected.

Claims **1, 3, 6-9, 11, 14-17, 19, 22-27** and **33** have been amended. No new matter has been added. Support for these claim amendments can be found throughout the instant Specification, including, for example, at ¶¶ [0034] and [0042]-[0044] of the originally-filed Application.

Applicants would also like to thank Examiner Fisher for the Interview conducted on August 19, 2011. Applicants respectfully submit that the Amendments and Remarks presented herein are in accord with those discussions.

*Rejection of Claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)*

Claims 1, 3, 6-9, 11, 14-17, 19, and 22-27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as purportedly being unpatentable over Bingham et al., U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0069094 (“Bingham”) in view of Couch et al., U. S. Patent No. 4,752,876 (“Couch”), further in view of Edward B. Fiske: “Christmas in Williamsburg” (Dec. 25, 1983) (“Fiske”) and further in view of Smith et al., U. S. Patent No. 6,085,164 (“Smith”). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 33 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as purportedly being unpatentable over Bingham et al., U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0069094 (“Bingham”) in view of Couch et al., U. S. Patent No. 4,752,876 (“Couch”). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

With regard to claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited sections of Bingham, Couch, Fiske, and Smith (alone or in combination) fail to show, teach, or even suggest the limitations of claim 1. In particular, the cited sections of Bingham, Couch, Fiske, and Smith fail to show, teach, or even suggest assigning a threshold revenue value to each of a plurality of function spaces. This is because the cited sections of Bingham, Couch, Fiske, and Smith (alone or in combination) fail to show, teach, or even suggest a threshold revenue value for a function space, particularly where such a threshold revenue value represents a minimum amount of revenue required to allow use of the function space.

The Office Action relies on the cited sections of Bingham to disclose a system for reserving resources for a meeting. *See* Office Action, pp. 3-11. The cited sections of Bingham purportedly provide that a resource for a meeting can be reserved based on a set of requested criteria (e.g., date, time, desired food and beverage service, and so on) and pricing rules (e.g., corporate discounts, facility employee adjustments, and so on). *See* Bingham, ¶¶ [0029], [0033], & [0038]. However, none of Bingham's criteria and/or pricing rules disclose the use, or even the consideration of, a threshold revenue value that represents an amount of revenue that, having been met, thus allows use of a function space, as claimed. Using the same rationale, the cited sections of Bingham cannot be properly relied upon to disclose the claimed act of automatically providing a real-time price quote for a function space based on a set of pricing rules and a threshold revenue value assigned to the function space.

Thus, the cited sections of Bingham fail to show, teach, or even suggest assigning a threshold revenue value to each of a plurality of function spaces, wherein the threshold

revenue value identifies a minimum amount of revenue required to allow use of the function spaces. In addition, the cited sections of Couch, Fiske, and Smith also fail to show, teach, or even suggest the above limitations of claim 1.

For at least these reasons, the cited sections of Bingham, Couch, Fiske, and Smith (alone or in any possible combination) fail to show, teach, or even suggest all the limitations of claim 1. Independent claims 9, 17, and 33 have been amended in the same or similar manner as claim 1. Hence, Applicants respectfully request the reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections to claims 1, 9, 17, 33, and all claims depending therefrom.

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the amendments and remarks set forth herein, the application and the claims therein are believed to be in condition for allowance without any further examination and a notice to that effect is solicited. Nonetheless, should any issues remain that might be subject to resolution through a telephonic interview, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned.

If any extensions of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) are required in order for this submission to be considered timely, Applicants hereby petition for such extensions. Applicants also hereby authorize that any fees due for such extensions or any other fee associated with this submission, as specified in 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or § 1.17, be charged to Deposit Account 502306.

Respectfully submitted,

/ Samuel G. Campbell III /

Samuel G. Campbell III  
Attorney for Applicants  
Reg. No. 42,381  
Telephone: (512) 439-5084  
Facsimile: (512) 439-5099